Ms. Ellen Ray and/or
Mr. William Schapp
Lies of Our Times
145 West 4 St.,
New York, N.Y. 10012

12/11/91

Dear Liers,

What is beyond reasonable question is that a letter is not a submission of an article and that one of close to 10,000 words is not intended for publication in a magazine in which the articles addressed are of but a couple of pages in length.

Your non-response is thereafore still another demonstration of your personal and professional disregard if not contempt for the traditional standards of journalism, of being truthful and fair with readers and not imposing upon their trust and of being honest with trusting readers by correcting errors.

Based on a previous experience with you in which you did not respond and did not correct a gruesome error in which you deceived and mislead and, naturally, further confused your trusting readers by publishing, without any effort to determine whether or not it was true or even reasonable a knowing false article by the British TV producers, John Edgington and John Sargent attributing the assassination of Dr. King to the CIA, I did not expect honesty from you

However, I did give you an opportunity to be honest, with yourselves and with your readers. A second reason for my taking all that time was to make a record for history, believing the political assassinations are that singificant in our history and, of course, in the changes that followed each.

You have additional reason for embarrassment and that reason is an additional challenge to your personal and professional integrity: You (collectively) published Garrison's disgraceful and utterly false self-justification and that also without the most primitive effort to check for facts and accuracy.

As with the King trash you are unrepentent, without the simple honesty of facing what you did or facing your readers who trust you and believe you. You therefore have the intention of lying to them and deceiving them for your own reasons.

In the unsigned postal card half of which is taken up by your self-promotion you refer to my letters as a "submission" and as an "article" when obviously it was neither. It was written namelessly by someone who had the gall to refer to my serious criticism this way: "We really appreciate your interest...."

This is a decent, an honorable response by professional and principled journalists when they do not dispute a detailed proof that each and every article they published relating to the Oliver Stone commercialization and exploitation of the great national tragedy of the JFK assassination is dishonest and false - including even manufactured direct quotations?

While you intended it to have other application and meaning, I quote from your state-

ment to your readers in a box on page 2 of the issue I addressed, September's:

"Our 'Lies' are more than literal falsehoods, they encompass subjects that have been ignored, hypocracies, misleading emphases, and hidden premises - the biases which systematically shape reporting."

You have with me and with this additional abuse of the trust of your readers made this, your intended criticism of others, fit you perfectly.

Journalists who lie, whether of not knowingly, and who refuse to correct their lies intend to be liars. You lied, you refuse to correct any of your many lies in this one issue and on this one subject, of whoring for Oliver Stone, and I have made the record that was one of my obejctives in taking all the time I took when I am 78 and in impaired health and each thing I do is at the cost of something else I'll not as a result be able to do. I also had the purpose of giving you(plural) a chance to recapture your personal and professional integrity and self-respect. and, belatedly, be honest with your readers.

To underscore this of the innumerable lies I addressed to you I here refer to just one that I believe will be adequate to any in the future who may read this without or before reading the almost a third of a small book that I sent you and you ignored.

On page 6 your professor emeritus of communications, Herbert I. Schiller, manufactured a direct quotation to give it the meaning that is the opposite of the meaning it had. I enclosed a copy of what he said he was quoting.

Schiller's intent, unless he entirely abandoned traditional and correct principles of the profession he teaches, was deliberate dishonesty for an intended dishonest purpose.

Your ignoring this after you published it means that your original and continuing purpose is dishonesty for a political if not also a commercial purpose, the latter referring to the fact that you, Sheridan Square Press, Inc., are also publishers of Garrison's book on which the movie is based, for the right to use it Oliver Stone paid, and that book, without a single one of the many lies in it that I called to Oliver Stone's attention in my letter of February 8, 1991 corrected or eliminated, has not been reprtinted by part of the corporate structure that gave Oliver Stone an undenied $40,000,000 (cor) for his rewriting of our tragic history.

As I once said to an interviewer who questioned me on this subject, knowing that I, not the CIA of Stone's contrivance, so faithfully repeated by his sycophants, launched this exposure of his commercialization and exploitation, those who sell sex have more principle, are better people.

Knowing the truth, that there was no major-media campaign against Stone and his sordid commercialization and exploitation (how I wish there had been!), you and your Zachary Sklar, also a journalism professor, Garrison's editor and co-author of Stone's script, were indecent and unprincipled enough to convert my strong opposition to what Stone is up to into voluntary support of it in saying that that Stone/Sklar "incorporates information (sic!) from ....Harold Weisberg..." You thus add shameless to your many dishonesties. Harold Weisberg

Resumed 12/15 while reading and correcting. The Texas Monthly in the course of its own sycophancy confirms what I thought I recalled, meeting at least Ray if not both of you in New Orleans. It also says that Ray interested Stone in making a movie of the book you published. Where I begin referring to your abuse of the trust of your readers I add that your omission of this added personal involvement, your direct responsibility for both Stone's rewriting of our history and the ensuing controversy, is another count of your abuse of trust and lack of honesty with your readers. Also, should you not have confessed a commercial interest in the movie? Did Stone or Warner pay the publisher anything at all? Had you reverted your rights to Garrison? If not, you do have a financial stake you hide from your readers. and this series of utterly dishonest articles cannot be separated from any financial interest or the other obvious interests.

I think I met Ray if not both of you because there was a man with her twice, once in Garrison's office, when I think you had a 16mm camera, and one in a barren hotel room in the French Quarter, where I went by coincidence, as best I now recall having been sent with something by one of Garrison's staff. I stayed only briefly and recall that immediately I felt I was not welcome, that perhaps I had intruded without so intending. I have a clear recollection of one in your party who despite his professional experience was utterly incompetent and irresponsible and who had a direct responsibility in planting an obvious disinformation on Garrison, Bill Turner. He had spent 10 years doing black bag jobs for the FBI. This establishes the principles by which he lives, those I believe that you have in the past condemned and exposed. Not only did this lead to Garrison's endorsing of the obviously fake SDECE book, "L'Amerique Brule," which Garrison got it to retitled, "Farewell America," he was about to sponsor the movie they made of it when - broke that up.

Turner was also involved in one of the viler Garrison concoctions. He imagined a sado-massochist ring of the wealthy and influential as involved in the assassination. He and Turner had "Jim Rose" working on it in Los Angeles, which means inventing "evidence" when I caught "Rose" at it and broke that up. How vile was this ploy? In addition to those who were wealthy and influential it included at least one man very close to JFK. And it was made up out of nothing other than Clay Shaw's preferences.

While I am not at all certain that you were present in Garrison's office the morning he had Charles Hall Steele II in for questioning, when he showed his greatest discovery, as he described it to me in asking me to return to New Orleans from Dallas instead of going home when I was ill and had been away from home for a month, but I believe you were. That "discovery" was a poor copy of the remaining WDSU-TV Oswald footage. Garrison was ecstatic when he pointed to a man he said was Shaw and who wasn't and in pointing out to us that a certain door was Shaw's secret entrance into the building he managed. Why he needed any secret entrance we were not told but the door he pointed to could not be opened fron the outside. It was a fire door.

His questioning of Steele was so incompetent he failed to learn what I had already learned from another source, that Oswald had another young man in addition to Steele helping him when he picketed Shaw's building. After Garrison finished I elicited this from Steele, you all heard him confirm it (assuming you were there then) and neither Garrison nor any of the other derring-do "investigators" carried it forward at all.

This is far from all the proof that Oswald had associates in New Orleans and it is not the only such lead he did not follow, a requisite for anything that can without shame and embarrassment be called an investigation, particularly because he had charged Oswald with being part of the conspiracy he invented, without a shred of evidence to support it.

So, if you were there and if you were not stupid you had this, rather these two, clear indications that Garrison was irrational and incompetent.

Until then just about all my work in New Orleans was on Oswald. Toward the end it was almost all on damage control.

By the time you were there it was without question that Garrison had invented and was continuing to invent non-existing conspiracies you planned to make into a movie! So much for you as an "investigator" and for your perceptiveness and judgement.

All of the alleged CIA efforts to wreck Garrison's non-existing "investigation" are inventions, with no basis in fact at all. The truth is that his adventures and the kind of dishonesty you published help the miscreants in government, as records I've gotten from the CIA, FBI and DJ leave without question. Yet when there was a real live lead on what seemed to be and I think was a real one all of you ignored it, Garrison in particular.

This was the planting of the fake book by SCEDE through Turner and Rose and as I recall Stanley Sheinbrun and Warren Hinckle. Why, none of you asked, if any of you had the common sense to recognize it as the fraud it was, would SDECE have any interest in doing all that work, going to all that trouble and expense? Had SDECE any interest or did this serve any legitimate interest or need of the French CIA? If not, then for whom did SDECE go to this cost, trouble and expense, take all that effort from its own work?

As soon as I learned that Stone was basing his movie on the deliberately dishonest book you published I wrote him in some detail, with more than enough specifics, some enclosed documentation and I offered more and to respond to any questions he had. I began that letter, of 2/8/91, some time before he began shooting, by telling him he had every right to be a Mack Sennett producing a Keystone Kops movie with a Pink Panther but that this was not in accord with the needs of pepresentative society. Neither then nor since has he responded except when I wrote him proving that his Washington Post article was wrong, point by point, I got a thinly-disguised offer to be bribed from Rusconi. I declined it. So instead he started trading on my name, as did your Sklar.

My point here is that in addition to the monumental dishonesty and gross inaccuracy of your issue you, too, are Pink Panthers, despite all your supposed expertise on the

spookeries. If you could sit still through that hotel meeting into which I blundered and not realize that Garrison was ecstatic over insanities then you were as irrational on this subject as he.

In a sense this is even more of an indictment of you than of him because you were there ostensibly as reporters, albit the reporting was to have been on film.

If you had the requisite critical faculties you abandonned them and became sycophants. Which is precisely what you are in the issue of lies about which I write you again.

We are none of us Merlins who can remember the future. And the future is very close now, only five days away. The day before the public showing and the day after what I understand will be a private showing in Washington, to a carefully-selected audience, Nightline will give this some attention. I do not know the nature of this attention. I hear that other elements of the major media have indicated some interest. I do hope it develops because the Stone fabrication, that he is the victim of a major media, Establishment campaign, as as spurious as the book you published and the artciles of more recent date.

I started all of this, I am not either CIA nor Establishment. Thereafter the story carried itself, as I believed it would when I stated it and as I believe was justified. But maybe this one time those unjustly vilified for self-promotion will make the effort to retaliate. I hope they do because this crime was a turning point in history and because Garrison, Stone and you have trivialized it in exploiting and commercializing it. In doing this you have become collaborators with those officials who failed us in that time of great tragedy and since.

As all the basic institutions of our society failed us then, so also have you and Garrison and your stable of sycophants joined Stone in failing society again and in doing still more harm by taking disinformation and misinformation to more people than anything since the Warren report and the Garrison fiasco.

I don't really care if you respond, I do not expect you to, you had your chance to save your faces and what reputations you have when you fobbed off my first letter. Because my purpose is to leave an accurate record for history, whether or hot anyone ever develops an interest in it - and not being Merlins we cannot know - by what you published, beginning with that fraudulent account of the trail on which Garrison never once set foot and continuing though this disgraceful issue of Lies, and what you refused to publish in any form of correction or apology, you have written your own part if this history and absent something new I am content to leave it there.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg